DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 470 SP 027 823

AUTHOR Matthes, William A.
TITLE Colleges of Education: Cultures or Organizations.
PUB DATE 28 Feb 86
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 26-March 1, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; *Cultural Context; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Preservice Teacher Education; Role Perception; *Schools of Education; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Educators; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper examines colleges of education from a cultural rather than the more formal organizational or structural perspective. Culture is defined as the pattern of basic assumptions that a group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. A discussion is presented on the cultural elements shared in teacher education schools by the professoriate, the deans, and schools of education as institutions embedded in the general undergraduate course of the university or liberal arts college. Brief summaries are presented of current research findings on the attitudes, goals, and role expectations of teacher educators, deans of colleges of education, and schools of education as institutions. The basic cultural assumptions of each of these elements in the training of teachers are outlined. A three-page list of references concludes the document. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271470

) SP027 823

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION: CULTURES OR ORGANIZATIONS

William A. Matthes
University of Iowa

With all the rhetoric on education appearing in the form of reports, legislative proposals, opinion polls and statements from the profession it is not surprising that teacher education is the target of reform. Politically vulnerable and misunderstood, teacher education is frequently viewed as responsible for the "condition" of education today Reformers recommend specific changes in teacher education with little appreciation of the present practice or the context. Spillane (1982) stated that:

> ...liberal education should constitute the formal educational preparation of teachers; it should be handled by professors of academic disciplines that make up the liberal arts (including, of course, mathematics and science), rather than by professors of education. (p. 21)

While the National Education Association (1982) contends that the preparation of teachers should involve extended periods of practice teaching controlled by practicing teachers. Such recommendations ignore the fact that the bulk of a teacher's preparation already is controlled by liberal arts colleges and practicing teachers. Institutions of higher education, the context for the preparation of teachers, are frequently represented as organizations complete with organizational charts and 'operations' manuals. Change the governance structure (e.g., create

---

Paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, February 28, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. A. Matthes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

advisory committees), or a dimension of the program (e.g., increase the requirements in liberal arts), and it is assumed that the teacher education program will change. Such an approach to change in institutions of higher education fail to capture the essence of organizations (Meyer and Scott, 1983). Frequently, there are unwritten norms and mores which govern the collegium that are not represented in an organizational chart, yet influence the institution and, therefore, the teacher education programs specifically. Wisniewski (1984) observed that:

> Teacher educators are conditioned to the folkways and mores of schools education. We internalize the norms and expectations of our institutions. We accept institutional practices, values and rituals as givens. (p. 2)

It is the intent of this author to examine colleges of education from a cultural perspective rather than the more formal organizational or structural perspective. It is the cultural perspective which captures the essence of human organizations which needs to be considered as change is contemplated. It is this perspective that explains the socialization of new members as noted by the Wisniewski (1984) statement. This is a perspective only recently being incorporated in the discussion of teacher education (Ducharme, 1985; Judge, 1982; Schwebel, 1985; Wisniewski, 1984). There are some potential "pitfalls" when one considers organizational cultures. Schein (1986) identified the following five major "pitfalls" one should be aware of:

1. "Superficial or incorrect definition of culture." The term "culture" is the most recent "buzzword" of the organizational development field. Yet, the definition varies greatly. Schein (1986) stated:

> ... culture is the pattern of basic assumptions that the group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems. (pp. 30-31)

It is a set of assumptions which unconsciously are ascribed to and require deeper analysis to understand.

2. "Too limited view of what cultural covers." All organizations do not have cultures. Culture evolves from the response of the organization to external forces over a period of time. These histories determine not only how authority/relationships issues are defined internally, but also how it survives.

3. "Stereotyping total cultures into general types." There simply is not enough known about organizations to develop accurate systems of classification. In fact, such efforts might be antithetical to the very process. Each organization has its own cast of characters, history, and mission.

4. "Simplistic views of how culture begins, evolves, and changes." Culture dictates the response to anxiety which is transmitted through the social-learning process. To disrupt these assumptions and patterns can create disruptive anxiety.

5. "Ignoring the effects of different organizational life stages on cultural issues." There are differences among organizational cultures which are driven by history. It is a developmental process which can be changed dramatically by external as well as internal events. One needs to consider the developmental stage and history when examining a culture.

Recognition of these "pitfalls" makes any attempt to analyze the culture of teacher education almost impossible. The difficulty is magnified by the sheer number of teacher education programs. Over 1,287 (Feistritzer, 1984) institutions of higher education offered teacher education programs during 1983. The variation among the institutions offering teacher education programs almost dooms such an effort, yet there are some common "cultural" dimensions which permeate teacher education. However, one needs to recognize certain unique external forces which contribute to teacher education differently than the traditional liberal arts programs. Teacher education is expected to be responsive to a profession which is not committed to a spirit of inquiry. Academe nurtures such a spirit. In addition, academe fosters "the self-actualization" of professors (Freedman, 1986), whereas schools foster a social service orientation (Howey, Matthes, and Zimpher, 1985). This conflict is evident, not only in the type of behavior fostered by different organizations, but also in the mechanisms used to monitor teacher education. Legally, states control the certification of educators

and the approval of teacher education programs, yet institutions which value independence and autonomy are responsible for the preparation of educators. Institutions of higher education nurture the spirit of inquiry among individuals who will encounter conditions where survival is basic. It is in this context that we turn now to an examination of the cultural elements shared in teacher education.

Professoriate: Boyer (1983) emphasized the hypocrisy of higher education in the recruitment and preparation of teachers. Higher education proclaims the importance of education but "Professors who work with schools are not rewarded and students who want to teach are often told that this would be a big mistake." (p. 173) Boyer (1983) continued "... colleges call for 'excellence in the schools' while spending several hundred million dollars every year recruiting athletes and spending virtually no time or money recruiting prospective teachers." (p. 173) Lanier (1984) observed that "... teacher education is practically everyone's, and yet no one's obvious responsibility or priority." (p. 9) The tendency in higher education is for the professor to identify with an academe discipline, a pattern one observes, even in colleges of education. A professor is a mathematics or science educator but not a teacher educator. Professors proclaim the importance of public education but no one will identify with it.

Few studies of the professoriate in education exist. Fuller and Bown (1975) describe teacher educators as drawn from humble origin who join the academy late; largely white, male, campus-bound faculty who emphasize

teaching. Although critized frequently for lack of scholarship, teacher educators publish at a rate comparable to faculty members in other disciplines (Ladd, 1979). Based upon a limited sample, Ducharme and Agne (1982) validated these findings. A more cautious conclusion about the scholarly productivity of teacher educators was reached by Schwebel (1982). He concluded "... that education is less productive in generating knowledge than agriculture and the biological sciences and very nearly on a par with the social sciences." (p. 26) However, Guba and Clark (1978), in a much more extensive study, state that on a per faculty member basis, even in the doctoral level schools, colleges, and universities, the norm was non-productivity. Less than 20 percent of the teacher education units had faculty actively engaged in research and development. Champion (1984) examined the use of research in undergraduate teacher education programs at six non-doctorate granting institutions of higher education and concluded:

> "... In essence, these teacher educators do not appear to be grasping for scientific evidence to convince their students or to develop firm rules for teaching." (p. 12)

Those who teach methods classes and supervise student teachers are characterized as lacking probing thought and analysis (Hogan, 1983; Katz and Raths, 1983; Zeichner and Tabachnich, 1982). Is it possible that the very emphasis on excessive technicalism which is a primary concern among teachers is actually modeled and nurtured in a non-reflective manner by teacher educators. Teacher educators who recognize the need for survival skills in their students might actually foster this pragmatism. Although

90 percent had experience as a classroom teacher, which typically amounted to approximately eight years, one wonders how long it has been since they actually taught. It suggests that even the techniques proposed are either dated or they have not employed them personally. Flexner, whose efforts lead to the implementation of the clinical, research and teaching model in medical education would note even today, not only the continued emphasis in teacher education on emphasis upon "atomistic training ... hostile to the development of intellectual grasp" (p. 174), but also the lack of clinical experience among teacher educators.

Assumptions: The following assumptions appear to guide the behavior of teacher educators:

a) Research and scholarship are of marginal value in the preparation of teachers. The lack of scholarship among teacher educators suggests that the predominate mode of preparation is based upon the apprentice model.

b) Teaching is primarily a set of specific skills and techniques. The focus of teacher education is upon a set of specific techniques which are essential to a future teacher survival. Little attention is given to the thoughtful examination of the teaching process.

Deans: Deans could best be conceptualized as "marginal people" neither faculty nor administrators. Little is known about this creature in higher education, yet expectations are quite high. In examining the perceived effectiveness of deans (Cole, 1983), it was found that they were

"moderately effective." Deans were perceived as most effective in faculty affairs, financial affairs, instructional programs and student affairs. They were perceived as least effective in the area of research. Of particular concern were the low overall ratings given by faculty across the five areas. When compared with other levels of decision makers (faculty, department chairpersons, dean, and chief academic officers) deans were perceived as most effective. The tenure of the person occupying the deanship might influence the perceived effectiveness of that individual. In assessing the "honeymoon period" of deans, Rooney and Clark (1982) found some differences in the perceptions of faculty of new deans, less than six years' service, versus, veteran deans, six or more years of service. New deans are perceived as influential in acquiring outside resources, changing the mission of the college, and creating change in the college. New deans are perceived as only influencing the research activities of the faculty and only slightly more likely to involve faculty in the decision making process.

When a limited number of deans (Fullerton, 1978) were asked to identify what they believed were important issues in education, as well as issues in the role of deans, one gleans some impressions of the deans' concerns. The primary issue for deans is the cultivation and promotion of ideas among faculty and students. Second, was the lack of time to publish, while the third was the lack of leisure time. When asked to rank in degree of importance selected skills, new deans (Heald, 1982), as did search committee chairs, indicated such items as leadership, decision making,

human relations, communication skills, faculty relations skills, and programmatic development skills as important. Scholarship was a prerequisite and not an essential skill to function; expected to lead but not remain current.

It is not uncommon for individuals to draw the parallel between the role of a building principal and a dean when it comes to programmatic change within a college of education. Deans have the capacity to block or stop programmatic change, but whether they are able to bring about change was an issue examined by Arends, Reinhard and Sivage (1981). Operating upon the belief the dean is important in stimulating change, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped established the Deans' Grant Program. It was a select sample of these grants that Arends, Reinhard, and Sivage (1981) investigated. They identified three clusters of behaviors: choreography, advocacy, and communication, which supported curriculum change in teacher education. Indeed, a dean can influence programmatic change.

Assumptions: The following assumptions appear to guide the behavior of deans of education:

a) Deans are "managers" of academic programs. Selected for their proven scholarship, deans are expected now to manage academic units. The degree of leadership in the actual development of new areas is dependent upon the deans' ability to achieve a balance between the internal and external forces which create anxiety and, therefore, shape a culture.

b) Deans are one of the primary methods institutions induce change in academa. The norms of the collegium are antithetical to this assumption but might reflect more on the nature of the faculty than the institution.

Institution: Contextual ambiance is further disturbed by the placement of teacher education programs in universities. "In almost all institutions, preservice programs for teachers are designed as an integral part of the undergraduate offerings of institutions" (Clark and Marker, 1975, p. 55). This design allows the teacher education program to be fitted in with the total undergraduate offerings, so that students may pursue teacher preparation and other institutional agendas simultaneously, like the liberal arts basic requirements, the development of a major subject area of specialization, and elective courses. The implication for most SCDEs is that their budgets are typically determined by instructional head count, rather than on the basis of their knowledge production and utilization function, which is more a measure synonymous with graduate level instruction.

Because of the embeddedness of teacher education programs in the general undergraduate course of study, "most undergraduates in preservice teacher preparation programs have a low level of professional identification with the field of education and the school, college or department of education" (Clark and Marker, 1975, p. 56). In particular, students majoring in secondary education often spend a very limited number of hours in education-specific courses (about

6-12 semester hours) before they become student teachers. Their identification, instead, resides with the subject area in which they specialize. Clark (1984) refers to this embeddedness as the "charm" of teacher education. Teacher education's charm is easy accessibility in every sense: it is geographically proximate to the consumer, easy to enter, short in duration, optimally convenient to other parts of the student's academic program, easy to complete, inexpensive, non-exclusive (it does not rule out other career options), and until recently, assured the graduate a reasonably good chance for employment.

Another dimension of the institutional condition of teacher education is its status within the larger milieu. As Clark and Marker (1975) noted, "teacher training is a low prestige, low cost venture in almost all institutions of higher education." Lanier (1984) posits that there are several reasons for this low support/low status position. First, because teacher education programs are a composite of course requirements from at least two major areas outside the SCDE, the general studies and major content areas, and because some programs offer teacher education programs that are not typically housed in SCDEs (e.g., agricultural education, home economics education), there are, in her words, "too many warring factions in control of small pieces of the enterprise." (p. 108) Teacher education also suffers from a perceived weak knowledge base, continues to be viewed as a non-profession, is weak politically because it serves women and children, it cannot be selective about its clients, and, consequently, its faculty cannot compete either with the best

professional schools or the arts and sciences (Judge, 1982). Sykes (1983) referred to teacher education programs as the "intellectual ghetto". Clark (1984) concluded that other professors judge teacher education students to be of low quality, and are aware of the program's low support level from the university, and, therefore, quickly surmise for themselves that teacher education is not a quality program.

Problems with status are not unrelated to the financial condition of teacher education. In the first place, expenditures for teacher education are geared at the general undergraduate baccalaureate level which presupposes that the delivery of instruction in teacher education can be effected in the lecture discussion mode, just as for many survey/lecture courses in the liberal arts. Rarely do other professional programs carry the same assumptions. For instance, the state funding formula for Texas uses a joint index to determine allocations for various programs. Against this "complexity index, the lowest funded programs are at the 1.0 level, teacher education is at 1.04, agriculture at 1.51, engineering at 1.51, and nursing at 2.74" (Peseau and Orr, 1980). In other comparisons, Peseau and Orr show that teacher education received only 50% of the funding level for other undergraduate programs, and only 65% of what is expended for public school per pupil rates. Specifically, the teacher education per pupil expenditure is $927.00, the average FTE university expenditure is $2,363.00, and the average public school per pupil expenditure is $1,400.00 (Peseau and Orr, 1980). It is obviously the case that teacher education programs subsidize many other programs in the university.

Also, state funding formulas are historical in that previous student credit-hour generation drives future funding levels. Even as education may generate larger subsidies because of sheer size, even at a lower rate (Temple and Riggs, 1978), these funds are often reallocated against different criteria once the funds reach the university (Orr and Peseau, 1979). Peseau and Orr suggested that teacher education accepted expanded responsibility without the resources often because of its inability to define goals adequately enough to request additional support. Both Clark and Marker (1975) and Kerr (1983) predict that this condition will not change until teacher education is moved out of undergraduate education. In essence, teacher education has little time within the undergraduate program to adequately prepare teachers, with severe limits on the resources available to support these needs, and with essentially non-functioning programs at the secondary level. Clark (1984) observed that "underfunding a program that has other major disadvantages structural and demographic characteristics is akin to providing the least support to public schools serving disadvantaged school populations." (p. 15)

Assumptions: The following assumptions appear to guide the behavior of institutions:

a) Teacher education generates revenue and provides a convenient career option for the masses. It is well documented that teacher education is not funded at the same level as other academic units. However, it also provides a career option for the less talented.

b) Teacher education is an ancillary function of academic units. Academic units are more concerned about scholarship and preparation of individuals in the unit than "serving" teacher education. Service courses are burdensome and not valued.

SUMMARY

The intent of this paper was to create an awareness of the culture in teacher education which transcends institutions of higher education. The reality is that there will be individual variations on the assumptions identified and these are but a few examples.

REFERENCES

Arends, R.L., Reinhard, D.L. and Sivage C.A. (1981). The education dean: an examination of behaviors associated with special projects. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (5), 14-20.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: a report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Champion, R. (1984). Faculty reported use of research in teacher preparation courses: six instructional scenarios. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (5), 9-12.

Clark, D.L. (1984). Better teachers for the year 2000: a proposal for the structural reform of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (2), 116-120.

Clark, D. and Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In Ryan, K. (Ed.) Teacher education: The seventy-fourth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cole, B.R. (1983). Administrative effectiveness of deans of education on decisions affecting teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (4), 48-51.

Ducharme, E.R. (1985). Establishing the place of teacher education in the university. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 8-11.

Ducharme, E.R. and Agne, R.M. (1982). The education professoriate: a research-based perspective. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (6), 30-36.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1984). The making of a teacher. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Information.

Freedman, J.O. (1986). The professor's life, though rarely clear to outsiders, has its rewards - and costs. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 31 (23), 92.

Fuller and Bown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In Ryan, K. (Ed.) Teacher education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fullerton, N.H. (1978). Issues in the role of dean. Journal of Teacher Education, 29 (5), 23-25.

Guba, E.G. and Clark, D.L. (1978). Levels of R & D productivity in schools of education. Educational Researcher, 7 (5), 3-9.

Heald, J.E. (1982). Education deans and their selections. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (1), 47-49.

References (continued)

Hogan, P. (1983). The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9 (1), 30-45.

Howey, K.R., Matthes, W.A., and Zimpher, N. (1985). Issues and Problems in Staff Development. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Elmhurst, Il.

Judge, H. (1982), American graduate schools of education: a view from abroad. New York: Ford Foundation.

Katz, L. and Raths, J.D. (1982). The best intention for education of teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 4 (1), 8-16.

Kerr, D.H. (1983). Teaching competence and teacher education in the United States. Teachers College Record, 81 (3), 525-552.

Ladd, E. (1979). The work experience of American college professors: some data and an argument. Current Issues in Higher Education, 3-13.

Lanier, J.E. (1984). Research on teacher education. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R. (1983). Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

National Education Association (1982). Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

Orr, P. and Peseau, B. (1979). Formula funding is not the problem in teacher education. Peabody Journal of Education, 57 (1), 61-71.

Peseau, B. and Orr, P. (1980). The outrageous underfunding of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 62 (2), 100-102.

Rooney, P.M. and Clark, D.L. (1982). New deans, old deans: a test of the "honeymoon period" hypothesis. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (5), 47-49.

Schein, E.H. (1986). What you need to know about organizational culture. Training and Development Journal, 40 (1), 30-33.

Schwebel, M. (1982). Research productivity of education faculty: a comparative study. Educational Studies, 13, 224-239.

Schwebel, M. (1985). The clash of cultures in academe: the university and the education faculty. Journal of Teacher Education, 36. 2-7.

Spillane, R. (1982). Some unfortunate assumptions. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (1), 21.

References (continued)

Sykes, G. (1983). Teacher preparation and the teacher workforce: problems and prospects for the 80s. American Education, 19 (2), 22-30.

Temple, C. and Riggs, R. (1978). The declining suitability of the formula approach to public higher education. Peabody Journal of Education, 55 (4), 351-357.

Wisniewski, R. (1984). The scholarly ethos in schools of education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (V), 2-9.

Zeichner, K.M. and Tabachnich, B.R. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in the elementary student teaching program. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8 (1), 34-54.